

not stand the rack! I am sorry for him. He did as the President told him.

What was the reason for all this? Massachusetts did not like the war even then, yet gave her consent. Why so? There are two words which can drive all the bloom out of the cheeks of cowardly men in Massachusetts. They are "Federalism" and "Hartford Convention." The fear of these words palsied the conscience of Massachusetts, and her Governor did as he was told! I feel no fear of either. The Federalists were the traitors—Who ever did? They had not seen all things which were destined to sway the nation; they looked back when the age looked forward. But to their own ideas they were true; and if a nobler body of men ever held state in any nation, I have yet to learn who they were. If we had had the shadow of Catech Strong in your Governor's chair, not a volunteer had gone out of Massachusetts.

I have not told quite all the reasons why Massachusetts did nothing. Men knew the war would cost dollars—the dollars would in the end be raised, not by a direct tax, of which the poor man paid according to his ability, and the rich man in proportion to his property, but by a tariff which pressed light on the backs and mouths of people. Some of the Whigs last June were glad when the war came, for they hoped thereby to save the child of their old age, the tariff of '42.

There are always some rich men who say, "No matter what sort of a government we have, so long as we get our dividends," always some poor men who say, "No matter how much the nation suffers, if we fill our hungry purses thereby." Well, they lost their virtue; lost their truth and gained just nothing; what they deserved to gain.

Now a third opportunity has come! No, it has not come; we have brought it. Now is the time to profit. The President wants a war-tax on tea and coffee. Let that Democratic tax every man's breakfast and supper for the sake of getting more territory to whip negroes in! (Numerous cries of "Yes.") Then what do you think despots would do? He asks a loan of \$25,000,000 for this war! He wants \$2,000,000 to spend privately for the war! In eight months past, I am told, he has asked for \$7,000,000 to conquer new slave territory! Is that Democratic, too? He wants to increase the standing army; to have ten regiments more! A pretty business that. Ten regiments to gag the people in Faneuil Hall. Do you think that is Democratic? Some men just asked Massachusetts for \$20,000 for the volunteers! It is time for the people to rebuke all this wickedness.

I think there is a good deal to excuse the volunteers. I blame them, for some of them know what they are about. Yet I pity them more, for most of them, I am told, are low, ignorant men; some of them drunken and brutal. From the quar they make here tonight—arise in the heads—I think what was told me is true! I say I pity them! They are my brethren. If they are so needy that they are forced to enlist by poverty, surely I pity them. If they are of good families, and know better, I pity them still more! I blame most the men that have duped the rank and file! I blame the Captains and Colonels, who will have least of the hardships, most of the pay, and all of the glory. I blame the men that made the war—the men that make money out of it. I blame the great party men of the land. Did not Mr. Clay say he hoped he could slay a Mexican? (Cries, "No, he didn't.") Yes, he did—said it on Forefathers' day! Did not Mr. Webster, in the streets of Philadelphia, bid the volunteers go and uphold the stars of their country? (A voice, "He did right!") No, he should have said the stars of our country, for every volunteer is a star on the nation's back! Did he not declare this war unconstitutional, and threaten to impeach the President who made it, and then go and invest a son in it? Has it not been said here, "Our country has never been bounded"—bounded by robbery or bounded by right lines! Has it not been said, all around, "Our country, right or wrong?"

I say I blame not so much the volunteers as the famous men who deceive the nation! (Cries of "Throw him over," &c.) Throw him over! You will not throw him over! I shall walk home unarmed and unattended, and no man of you will hurt one hair of my head.

I say again, it is time for the people to take up this matter. Your Congress will do nothing till you tell them what and how! Your 29th Congress can do little good. Its sands are nearly run. God be thanked! It is the most inflexible Congress we ever had. We began with the Congress that declared independence, and swore by the Eternal Justice of God. We have come down to the 29th Congress, which declared war existed by the act of Mexico—declared a lie—the Congress that swore by the Baltimore Convention! We began with George Washington, and have got down to James K. Polk. It is time for the people of Massachusetts to instruct their servants in Congress to oppose this war; to refuse all supplies for it; to ask for the recall of the army into our own land. It is time for us to tell them, that not an inch of waste territory shall ever be added to the realm. Let us remonstrate, let us petition; let us command. If any class of men have hitherto been remiss, let them come forward now, and give us their names—the merchants, the manufacturers, the Whigs and the Democrats. If men love their country better than their party or their purse, now let them show it.

Let us ask the General Court of Massachusetts to cancel every commission which the Governor has given to the officers of the volunteers. Let us ask them to disband the companies not yet mustered into actual service; and then, if you like that, ask them to call a convention of the people of Massachusetts, to see what we shall do in reference to the war—in reference to the annexation of more territory—in reference to the violation of the Constitution! (Loud groans from crowds of rude fellows in several parts of the Hall.) That was a Tory groan; they never dared groan so in Faneuil Hall before; not even the British Tories, when they had no bayonets to back them up! I say, let us ask for these things!

Your President tells us it is treason to talk so! Treason is it! Treason to discuss a war which the government made, and which the people are made to pay for! If it be treason to speak against the war, what was it to make the war—to ask for 50,000 men and \$74,000,000 for the war? Why, if the people can't discuss the war they have got to fight, to pay for, who under Heaven can? Whose business is it, if it is not yours and mine? If

my country is in the wrong, and I know it, and hold my peace, then I am guilty of treason—moral treason. Why, a wrong—it is only the threshold of ruin. I would not have my country take the next step. Treason is it, to show that this war is wrong and wicked? Why, what if George III., any time from '75 to '83, had gone down to Parliament, and told them it was treason to discuss the war then waging against these colonies? What do you think the Commons would have said? What would the Lords say? Why, that king—foolish as he was—would have been lucky, if he had not learned there was a joint in his neck, and, stiff as he bore him, that the people knew how to find it.

I don't believe in killing kings, or any other men; but I do say, in a time when the nation was not in danger, that no British king, for two hundred years, would have dared call it treason to discuss the war—its cause, its progress, or its termination!

Now is the time to act! Twice we have let the occasion slip; beware of the third time! Let it be infamous for a New England man to enlist—for a New England merchant to loan his dollars, or to let his ships in aid of this wicked war; let it be infamous for a manufacturer to make a cannon, a sword, or a kernel of powder, to kill our brothers with, while we all know that they are in the right, and we in the wrong.

I know my voice is a feeble one in Massachusetts. I have no mountainous position from whence to look down and overawe the multitude; I have no background of reputation to echo my words; I am but a plain, humble man; but I have a background of truth to sustain me, and the justice of Heaven arches over my head! For your sakes, I wish I had that oceanic eloquence, whose tidal flow bears on its bosom the drift wood, which politicians have piled together, and says and sweeps away the sand hillocks of solidary blunders together by the idle wind—that oceanic eloquence which sweeps all before it, that leaves the shore hard, smooth and clean! But, feeble as I am, let me beg of you, fellow citizens of Boston, men and brothers, to come forward and protest against this wicked war, and the end for which it is waged. I call on the Democrats, who think justice is greater than the Baltimore Convention (forward and join with me in opposing this wicked war! I call on the men of Boston, on the men of the Old Bay State, to act worthily of the Fathers, worthy of their country, worthy of themselves! Men and brothers, I call on you all to protest against this most infamous war—in the name of the State, in the name of the country, in the name of man—yes, in the name of God! Leave not your children saddled with a war debt, to cripple the nation's commerce for years to come. Leave not your land cursed with slavery, extended and extending, palying the nation's art and corrupting the nation's heart. Leave not your intemperate infamies among the nations, because you feared men—feared the government—because you loved money got by crime, land plundered in war—loved land and justice bounded—because you debased your country by defending the wrong she dared to do—because you loved slavery, loved war, but loved not the eternal justice of all judging God. If my counsel is weak and poor, follow one stronger and more manly. I am speaking to men—think of these things, and then act like men.

#### COMMUNICATIONS.

##### The Cincinnati Herald.

On the first page of this week's paper will be found two articles from the Cincinnati Herald. The last speaks of the Ohio Regiment and its leaders—the first finds fault with some remarks I made in the Bugle, when conducting it, as pro tem. Editor. The Herald says my remarks are disingenuous, and it can scarcely conceive how misstatements so numerous and so glaring, could have been innocently crowded into so small a space. At present, the Herald is charitably inclined to set down my offence to the sin of ignorance rather than to malice. If it did not prove that I had made numerous and glaring misstatements, it did prove that its Editor was, at least, very much out of temper.

But what did I state that the Herald denies? Why its Editor denies that he labored through nearly a column to prove the Ohio Volunteers no cowards. He says "we wrote an article, the one referred to, to show that the volunteers and the presses of the slave States, in strict accordance with their envious and jealous spirit, usurping all that the world considers profitable to themselves and denying it to the citizens of the free States, had got up a false accusation against the courage of the Ohio Troops," and adds "we said not one word in admiration of the war, or of the conduct of the soldiers."

I said that the Herald labored to prove that the Ohio volunteers were no cowards, as had been charged upon them; but that they exhibited that kind of bull-dog courage, which made them careless of their own lives, in their eagerness to murder the Mexicans. Not so, says the Herald, "we wrote the article to show that the volunteers and presses of the slave States had in their envious and jealous spirit got up a false accusation against the courage of the Ohio Troops."

Now I am willing to admit that the Editor of the Herald is capable of making very nice metaphysical distinctions—he may make distinctions between a want of courage and cowardice, and satisfy himself by his mode of reasoning; but I doubt whether he can make others understand how he can vindicate the Ohio troops from a false accusation against their courage, without vindicating them from the charge of cowardice.

The case may be thus stated. A false accusation had been got up against the courage of the Ohio troops. The Herald denies that it labored to prove that these troops were not cowards—it only wrote the article to prove

that the accusation against their courage was a false one.

Is this puerility worthy of a paper professing to be anti-slavery—and professing too, to be trying to reform the morals of the country?

But it denies having said anything in admiration of the war. Did I charge it with doing this? Not at all. Why then does its Editor make the denial? Did the Ghost of some murdered Spaniard start up before him, causing him to exclaim, "I said nothing in admiration of the war?" But he also denies having said anything in admiration of the conduct of the soldiers.

What, I ask, is showing an accusation against their courage to be a false one, when the Editor considers that the Southern troops, in arrogating to themselves courage and denying it to others, are usurping what the world considers profitable, but saying something in admiration of the conduct of the soldiers when he proves them to have done that at the battle of Monterey which gives them a character for bravery?

This brings me to the reason why I said that the Herald quoted from the Advertiser to vindicate the courage of the Ohio troops. Those troops went to Mexico, for what? Was it for the pay they would receive? This certainly was too small an inducement. Why then did they go there to fight the battles of slavery? Was it from a mere ruffian thirst of blood—merely because they delighted in cutting and hacking and mangle their fellow men? Perhaps this was an influencing motive; but was it not in a great measure to gain what the world considers profitable pay? glory!—and have it said by the public presses that they were brave—to have those presses do just what the Herald has been doing? Does any one suppose these soldiers would have gone from Ohio to do as the Herald says "the work at which they were set, and find their best and saddest defense in the report of death's doings?"

aye, to do this work of murder—if profligate presses throughout the country were not to be found, that would Herald these deeds of violence as brave acts and glorious achievements, and defend them from any charges which would in the eyes of the murder-loving portion of the people tarnish their glory? The True Democrat quoted from the Advertiser to show what infamous and vile acts that paper was parading before the public as "Noble Exploits." The Herald quoted from it to vindicate the courage of these marauders from a false accusation. One thought that the statements it quoted should render those soldiers infamous—the other that they were evidences of their courage.

But in reference to my mis-statements.—Does the Herald deny that it opposed the war, but at the same time desired that the safety of Gen. Taylor, "that noble officer and his brave army," should not be jeopardized? Does it deny that it opposed the war, but said if England or France were to attempt an armed intervention, that the citizen, who believed in the righteousness of self-defense, and would not fly to beat them back, ought to be spurred the country? Does it deny that it was opposing the war professedly, when at the time, it was occupying its columns with vindications of the Ohio Volunteers from a false accusation against their courage?—that it was doing that which, perhaps, more than anything else stimulates men to enter the ranks of an army? If it does not, then where are my mis-statements?

I have occupied this much space in commenting upon the remarks of the Herald; and my apology for so doing exists in the fact, that while it is compromising principle and profligately pandering to a wicked sentiment, it still professes to be an anti-slavery paper—a paper for the purpose of reforming the morals of the people on the subject of slavery, and procuring its abolition. Because of those professions, it has the power of doing harm by its infidelity to principle, therefore is it necessary to expose its wickedness, weakness, and folly.

#### SAMUEL BROOKE.

##### Useless Organizations.

Every man is obliged to take the world as he finds it, and in passing through, he leaves it either better or worse. He adopts its customs, fashions, notions, and spirit, and so becomes conformed to the whole course of the world, or he becomes disgusted with these things and becomes transformed in his mind. Inasmuch as the world by some cause has become full of discord and confusion; the great business of man is to bring things into a state of order, and not be controlled by every wrong thing that surrounds him, but control in a great measure those evils with which he is environed; and unless he can do this in a greater or lesser degree, his influence is of no avail, and he might as well not have lived.

Now if the above remarks are well founded as it regards individuals, they will hold good of associations, and if so, we have come to the point at issue. If certain organizations are in existence—no matter what their names are—which cannot control certain wrongs but are controlled by those wrongs, such organizations might as well be out of the world as in. Organizations that have been founded in justice, mercy, and truth, have been a great blessing to community in pushing forward, not one, but all great benevolent enterprises. But those organizations which are for party purposes, which have not justice, mercy, and

truth, in them, have been a great curse to community by hedging up the way of reforms. We prefer no charges against any individuals, nor organizations, for the state of morals that was in the world, when they made their ingress; but we do impute guilt to those who when they saw the corruption existing around them, struggled not against the impure stream that was bearing pollution through the land.

Hence it appears that the great business of man in the world is to correct the errors of himself and his fellow men.

#### A Dish of Third Partyism.

##### FRIENDS EDITORS:

We have recently had a rare specimen of Third Partyism in this place. It came off on the eve of the 8th inst. But to give you an introduction to the men and facts, I must make you acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Prentiss, of Hantsburgh, who made his debut in New Lyme the first of Dec. last. It was in this wise. He was invited by a Liberty party friend to preach an anti-slavery sermon in the Baptist house. As it chanced to be the day on which Rev. Mr. Foot occupied the house, Mr. P.'s friend above referred to, proposed (he was a member of Mr. P.'s church,) that he give way for Mr. Prentiss in the afternoon. To this Mr. Foot objected, said he did not believe it right to desecrate the Sabbath and sanctuary by preaching abolition on Sunday, and demanded Mr. P.'s authority to preach, &c. Finally, the house was granted for the evening. After the afternoon service Mr. Prentiss arose and stated that he was a friend of the church—none felt more for his interests than he—it was a part of his mission to counteract the Garrisonian influence of tearing down the churches, &c. In the evening, however, he denounced the churches in true Garrisonian style; comparing poorly, I thought, with his previous explanation. He said they had stolen the liver of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in, and that such churches and ministers were a disgrace to perdition.

The next day he said to me that he was with Garrison on the church question, exactly. Another actor in the scene was Mr. Glester, a colored Liberty party lecturer. He came into a meeting at our place, in which our friend Curtis took part, who said in substance, that Liberty party, acting as it does and must, under a pro-slavery Constitution, is in a devilish position. At this Mr. Glester took umbrage, denounced the Garrisonians, and charged Mr. C. with calling all Liberty party men devils—then extolled Gerrit Smith with great warmth. Mr. Curtis explained by saying he referred to the position of Liberty party, not to the hearts of its members.

The next evening we assembled to hear Mr. Mason—whereupon Mr. Glester took the stand and repeated his tirade of the previous evening and eulogy upon G. Smith, and appointed a meeting on the evening of the 8th, for the purpose of showing the Liberty party to be the only hope of the slave. He said if I or any other one wished to reply after he was through, he had no objection. The 8th came, and found L. Peck, myself, and several other Disunionists at the meeting. I scarce ever before heard such a tirade of misrepresentation and falsehood, as he poured out upon the Garrisonians. After storming and ranting till about half past 8 o'clock, he wound up by exhorting his Liberty party friends to discontinue the Bugle, and all papers of like character.

Friend Peck showed in reply, that the Constitution is a pro-slavery compact, and that if it is not, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, &c., were perjured men, for they administered it as such. He proceeded to read from Gerrit Smith and Dr. Bailey, when Mr. Prentiss bawled out that he wished Mr. Peck would tell one truth to five lies; that Gerrit Smith and Liberty party have embraced each other; that Liberty party had disclaimed the sentiments read, and that the authors of some of them had been converted, &c. By Mr. Glester's saying he had given no liberty to reply, and by the aid of the rabble, they succeeded in gagging friend Peck. I have understood that the Chairman was so disgusted he left. Mr. Prentiss was challenged to discuss the question; but no—his opponents were too small men!

Now, dear friends, I think we can do better for the cause of humanity than to pay our money into the hands of such Liberty party speakers, as we have done in some cases. I am inclined to agree with the Hon. E. Wade, at an Anti-slavery Convention in Geneva on the 4th of July, 1840—in speaking of organizing the Liberty party he declared it to be a political scramble for office.

#### Your Friend,

H. REEVE.

#### Advice.

Give to society all that is due, tell the people what they have done, and what they have not done that they ought to do. Never overturn what virtue there is in the world—if the church has any moral honesty, or any of her members, they are entitled to the credit of it; if they are stubborn, "rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." Never flatter away the truth for the sake of their good will or ill will. Lecturers need a great degree of meekness, but not enough to make friends with the devil or his associates. It is an old adage, that "a sermon is not worth much unless the devil is made mad"—if he is some one or more is bene-

fitted. All men will never receive the truth—to some it is a savor of life unto life, to others a savor of death unto death. We have a great work before us—our platform is laid deep; we seek the renovation of moral sentiment. We invite all true-hearted people to assist; and I expect they would, if they could behold the labor of love we are engaged in.

M. E.

#### TO THE EDITORS OF THE BUGLE:—

My attention was called to an article in your paper of last week, from the pen of Hammond Thomas.

The article is, beyond all doubt, intended to injure the reputation of the American House, and is in itself a slander upon its landlord. I am sorry to see such an effort put forth, especially in a paper purporting, in every number, to be in favor of Temperance. The truth of the matter is, that this same Mr. Thomas had sought employment in the service of the landlord of the American House, and for reasons not necessary here to enumerate, he was not employed. And afterwards a conversation is distorted, and misrepresented, in order to inflict an injury upon one whom he could not reach by truth. Temperance men and anti-slavery men, who were known to be such, have testified of his hospitality through the medium of the press; and as a citizen and a Temperance man, with others, I have always considered the American House as a great auxiliary to the cause of Temperance in this village, and a benefit to community in general. The card below will set the matter to rights.

#### A TEMPERANCE MAN.

##### A CARD.

Having seen a statement in the Bugle, calculated to injure the reputation of the American House by slandering its landlord, I would say that I was present at the time the occurrence took place referred to by Hammond Thomas, and have only to say that his statement is not correct—it is untrue.

JOHN M. WEBB.

Salem, March 10, 1847.

N. B. Other testimony to the same effect can be obtained, if necessary.

J. M. W.

#### ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, MARCH 12, 1847.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

#### Special Notice.

The treasury of the Western Anti-Slavery Society is in immediate need of about one hundred dollars. Will those who have made pledges, oblige by forwarding the amount if convenient? If those who have neither made pledges nor given anything to the funds of the Society are disposed to contribute, will they please do so at once?

All the money forwarded will be acknowledged in the Bugle.

SAML. BROOKE, Gen. Agent.

#### "Comeoutism and Comeouters."

Some of the counts under the 7th head of the indictment which the author of "Comeoutism and Comeouters" has preferred against those who believe it is as much a duty to secede from a pro-slavery sect as to leave a pro-slavery political organization, read thus:—

1. The great denominations, and indeed all the ecclesiastical bodies in the land are put down pro-slavery.
2. Every local church connected with these bodies is, by virtue of that connection, pro-slavery.
3. Every minister of the gospel ecclesiastically related to any one of the religious denominations is ex-communicated pro-slavery.
4. Any church not immediately connected with the pro-slavery denominations, which gives or receives letters to or from churches which are so connected, becomes thereby partaker in the sin, its known anti-slavery character to the contrary notwithstanding.
5. A church which admits to its communion a Whig, or a Democrat, or a Liberty man, is pro-slavery.
6. The church which fellowships such a church, by exchanging letters of dismission and recommendation, is also pro-slavery.

If the positions herein stated be true, and if it be also true that no abolitionist can consistently fellowship, as christians, the members of a pro-slavery church, then is comeoutism most clearly a duty. But the question is asked are these positions true? It would, perhaps, hardly be worth while to attempt to prove that the leading denominations of the land are pro-slavery; every abolitionist is ready to admit this, at least that it is true of all save the one with which he is connected. And further; it can be readily demonstrated that the smaller as well as the larger denominations, aid in sustaining slavery by justifying it, apologizing for it, recognizing the slave-claimant as a christian, or by doing more to oppose the progress of anti-slavery principles than to destroy slavery. One exception should perhaps be made here: so far as we are acquainted with the Old School Covenanters, they are clear in all these particulars, though there is great need of more activity among them. There are also some individual churches of other

sects that, for aught we can learn, occupy a consistent position. We do not wish to be understood as intimating that these denominations have never given utterance to anti-slavery sentiments; but we do assert that their strength has been thrown upon the side of the oppressor, and the tyrant has felt secure in his power because of the support they have given him.

These denominations all claim to be christian, and perhaps are; but if their claim to this character is just, we have placed a wrong estimate upon christianity. Is that a christian church which recognizes as members of its body, in good and regular standing, the worshippers of Juggernaut? Certainly not! Is the universal response. Is that a christian church which holds union and communion with the followers of Mahomed, claiming them as beloved brethren in the Lord? Most assuredly not! Is the general answer. Is that a christian church which freely admits to membership the ordinary thief and robber? Unquestionably not! Is the reply. Does not a slaveholding church, or a church composed in part of slaveholders, exhibit as great a defection in christian character, as either of the three referred to? Is there a mother who would not sooner recognize as a christian brother the simple-hearted Pagan from Hindoo tan, than the slaveholder who claims her child as a part of his plantation stock? Is there a husband who would not rather commune with the Mahomedan, whose religion forbids him to enslave a brother in the faith, than with one whose tyrant hand has torn from him the wife of his bosom? Is there a brother who would not sooner hold religious fellowship with the pickpocket or highwayman who takes from him his purse, than with one who asserts a property-right in his sister—a right to dispose of her as caprice or fancied interest may dictate?

But the defenders of the christian character of slaveholding churches always here throw in the plea of ignorance, as a kind of half, if not whole justification of the slaveholder, who, they say, has never been taught that slavery was wrong, and that it would, therefore, be wrong to deny him the privileges of christian fellowship and church communion. To this we reply—although ignorance may palliate the guilt of the wrongdoer, it does not render him worthy of membership in a christian church. If it does, why not admit the poor Pagan whose father and whose brothers voluntarily sacrificed their lives on the altar of their religion; and who himself worships at the temple where they died, observing the same forms and ceremonies which have been hallowed by the observance of his ancestors for centuries? If it does, why not admit him who has ever dwelt within the shadow of the mosque, who has heard and obeyed since early infancy the daily call to prayer as it sounded from the minaret, who, with devout spirit ever proclaims "God is God, and Mahomed is his prophet!" If it does, why not admit that poor man who first breath was inhaled amid vice and pollution, who, an outcast from society, was left to grow up amid festering corruption, shut out from the blessed sunlight of God's truth and forced to grope his way in the dark and terrible paths of wickedness—who has been made to feel that his fellows had crushed and wronged him, and has been taught what he has ever practised, that as his fellow men had trampled upon him, it was right for him to rob them! Although the churches and the defenders of the churches endorse the christian character of the man-stealer because of his ignorance, they are not willing to act the same part by the Pagan, the Mahomedan, and the common thief. A reason for this may be found in the fact that Paganism is not popular here, that Mahomedanism is not in good repute, that ordinary thieving is far from respectable, while Manstealing is both fashionable and aristocratic.

According to our belief, a christian church is, or should be, a church of christians; and if any member of that church is engaged in an anti-christian business, or has perpetrated an anti-christian act—it matters not, so far as this point is concerned, whether he transgresses ignorantly or knowingly—that church, if it claims excommunicating power, is bound to discipline him, and cut him off unless he repents. Two cannot walk together unless they be agreed, and if the church retains the offending member it must either bring him up to where it stands, or go down to where he is. If the church may extend the right hand of christian fellowship to one unrepentant offender, the principle, if carried out, would allow every member to be an offender; and if the violators of one point in Christ's law be retained, upon the same principle the violators of another, and of every point may be retained, so that when this popular pro-slavery doctrine is pushed to the farthest legitimate point, we have a christian church composed of fiends incarnate. But the defenders of the church do not wish to have this principle applied to the Sabbath-breaker, the man guilty of petit larceny, or other criminals of the smaller kind; it is only designed to screen the wealthy and influential slaveholder and sinners of that class. It does seem as if the common sense of the people would at once decide that the denominations of this land—all those at least that receive the slaveholder as a communicant—are anti-christian; it would if left to itself, and it will when it breaks the shackles sectarianism has thrown around it. As to those denominations which do not admit slave-claimants to communion and fellowship, we may have some-